



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,205	07/13/2006	Carlo Liberale	CCVDresser030957 CMRN0006	4778
64833	7590	08/12/2011	EXAMINER	
FLETCHER YODER (CAMERON INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION) P.O. BOX 1212 HOUSTON, TX 77251			SCHNEIDER, CRAIG M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3753		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		08/12/2011		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/586,205	LIBERALE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
CRAIG SCHNEIDER	3753	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 02 August 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on 03 August 2011. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____ (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112/1st rejections of claims 10, 12-16, 18-22, and 24-26.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 Claim(s) allowed: _____.
 Claim(s) objected to: _____.
 Claim(s) rejected: 10, 12-16, 18-22 and 27-32.
 Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Craig M Schneider/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3753

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 8/2/11, with respect to the 112/1st rejections of claims 24 and 30 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 112/1st rejections of claims 24 and 30 have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 8/2/11 in regards to the 103 rejection of the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that Birtcher is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as applicant pointed out the applicant is interested in providing an atmosphere that provides an inert atmosphere in a corrosive environment per Remarks filed on 8/2/11 which further would be to provide an inert atmosphere. As indicated in the combination, the nitrogen atmosphere is being used because nitrogen is inert. It is well known to utilize nitrogen or an inert gas in an electronic environment to provide the enclosure with an environment that will not react with the electronics as is evident in Birtcher. The applicant is further arguing that none of the cited references, whether alone or in hypothetical combination, teach or suggest a submersible actuator including a housing having a control circuit disposed in pressurized nitrogen. The examiner as indicated in the rejection of claim 10 is utilizing Dalton, Jr. to provide support for a submersible actuator and further is utilizing Birtcher as support for the nitrogen environment.

In response to applicant's argument that the control circuit is configured to perform a function as noted in claims 14, 16, and 31; a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. The control circuit as identified in the claims is capable of performing logic operations (as claimed in claims 14, 16, and 31). This is indicated in the rejection of claim 14 and supported as per the disclosure of Johansen et al. (col. 7, line 61, to col. 8, line 4).

Continuation of 13. Other: The claims as indicated above are still being rejected. Please see the rejections that were made in the Final Office Action dated 4/4/11.